REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Drawings

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner accept the formal drawings submitted on February 27, 2004.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 3, and 11 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 2, 3, or 11.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1-3 and 11 have been amended by way of this reply to clarify the claimed invention. No new subject matter has been added by way of these amendments, as support for these amendments may be found, for example, in Figures 3A and 3B of the publication of the Specification and in paragraphs [0036]-[0045] of the publication of the Specification. Applicant believes the included amendments do not require a new search, or at least simplify issues for appeal, and accordingly, applicant respectfully requests entry and favorable consideration thereof.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2002-0159009 in the name of Funamoto *et al.* (hereinafter "Funamoto").

Independent claims 1-3 and 11 have been amended in this reply to clarify the present invention recited. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to a reflector used in a display device such as a liquid crystal display device. In one or more embodiments of the invention, a reflector (1) comprises a predetermined plane, a plurality of unit reflecting portions disposed parallel to said predetermined plane, a first reflection face (B1) arranged in a first unit reflecting portion (A1), and one or more second reflection faces (B2), arranged in a second unit reflecting portion (A2), adjacent to said first unit reflecting portion (A1). The first reflection face (B1) comprises a first tangential plane (7) tangent to the first reflecting face at a reference point (6) on the first reflection face (B1), and the second reflection face (B2) comprises a second tangential plane (8) parallel to said first tangential plane (7) and tangent to the second reflection face (B2) (*see, e.g.*, publication of the Specification, Figure 3A, paragraph [0036]).

At least one of the plurality of unit reflecting portions has a reflection face configured to reflect incident light in a different direction from regular reflection light of said predetermined plane. Further, a shortest distance (or an average thereof) between the reference point (6) and the second tangential plane(s) (8) may be half or more of a coherent length of sunlight. Alternatively, a shortest distance between the first tangential plane (7) and the second tangential plane (8) may be half or more of a coherent length of sunlight when a frequency distribution is calculated by setting to a variable the shortest distance between the first tangential plane and the second tangential plane (*see, e.g.*, publication of the Specification, paragraph [0040]).

Accordingly, amended independent claims 1, 3, and 11 require a first reflection face arranged in a first unit reflecting portion, comprising a first tangential plane tangent to the

first reflecting face and a second reflection face arranged in a second unit reflecting portion adjacent to said first unit reflecting portion, comprising a second tangential plane parallel to said first tangential plane and tangent to the second reflection face. Amended independent claim 2 requires a plurality of second reflection faces arranged in second unit reflecting portions adjacent to the first unit reflecting portion, each second reflection face comprising a second tangential plane parallel to said first tangential plane and tangent to the second reflection face.

Further, amended independent claim 1 requires that a shortest distance between a reference point of the first tangential plane and the second tangential plane is half or more of a coherent length of sunlight. Amended independent claim 2 requires that an average of a shortest distance between the reference point of the first tangential plane and each of the second tangential planes is half or more of a coherent length of sunlight. Amended independent claims 3 and 11 require that a shortest distance between the first tangential plane and the second tangential plane is half or more of a coherent length of sunlight when a frequency distribution is calculated by setting to a variable the shortest distance between the first tangential plane and the second tangential plane.

Funamoto does not disclose at least the above limitations of amended independent claims 1, 2, 3, or 11. Further, Funamoto fails to show or suggest these claim limitations. The Examiner asserts that because specific reference points were not required by the claims, the limitations regarding a distance between a first tangential plane and a second tangential plane was met by Funamoto (*see* Office Action dated January 13, 2006, at page 3). Further, the Examiner asserts that no claim language specifies what a coherent length of light is. These limitations have been clarified by the above amendments and remarks. Accordingly, in view of these clarifications, these limitations will be understood and it will be clear to one skilled in the art that Funamoto fails to show or suggest at least the specified limitations.

Funamoto, in contrast to the claimed invention, discloses a plurality of reflective subregions (13) formed by cutting convex portions (17) that are matched to the target exit region (*see* Funamoto, paragraph [0067]-[0068]). It would be clear to one skilled in the art that Funamoto fails to contemplate a first and a second tangential plane as required by the claimed invention, and further that Funamoto fails to show or suggest a shortest distance between a first tangential plane and one or more second tangential planes, as also required by the claims.

In view of the above, Funamoto fails to show or suggest the present invention as recited in amended independent claims 1-3 and 11. Thus, amended independent claims 1-3 and 11 are patentable over Funamoto. Claims 4 and 6-10, directly or indirectly dependent from claims 1-3 and 11, are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Funamoto. Independent claim 3 has been amended in this reply to clarify the present invention recited. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 3 requires that a shortest distance between the first tangential plane and the second tangential plane is half or more of a coherent length of sunlight when a frequency distribution is calculated by setting to a variable the shortest distance between the first tangential plane and the second tangential plane.

As discussed above, Funamoto does not show or suggest all the limitations of amended independent claim 3. Thus, amended independent claim 3 is patentable over

Funamoto. Claim 5, directly dependent from claim 3, is allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 15115/107001).

Dated: May 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By #45,079
Jonathan P. Osha THOMAS SCHERER
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

143873_1